

o

RESPONSES TO  
CONSULTATION WITH  
PLANNING OFFICERS ON  
BECKENHAM PLACE PARK  
REGENERATION 2017

Alison Taylor

PROJECT MANAGER, LONDON BOROUGH OF LEWISHAM

## Queries & issues raised

### Section A : Landscape Design

- Palisade fencing to depot not acceptable. Alternative proposal to be submitted.

The plans now include green weld mesh fencing to the rear of the depot area with planting to screen the fencing and long views in to the depot.

Please refer to the Depot Area Study by BDP for more details.

- Details of materials of proposed depot structures to be submitted.

The structures in the depot will be containers with slightly pitched roofs. These have been specified by the parks department to ensure their suitability for the vehicles and equipment they will need to store, and their longevity.

However, there will be no views in to the depot area from the entrance to the park, as a new timber fence will be erected behind the shrub planting to screen the depot from view and to enhance both the entrance experience as visitors arrive at the park, and the setting of the listed buildings – Southend Lodge and the Gate House. It is notable that the timber fence will also largely screen the one storey flat roofed extension to Southend Lodge.

Please refer to the depot study for more details.

- Outline landscape management plan required.

The management and maintenance plan submitted as part of HLF application is supplied in the file transfer. This plan will be revisited as the works come to a close to ensure it becomes an accurate, detailed and useful manual for grounds staff in the park.

- Details of treatment of existing pond required.  
No restoration of the pond is to be carried out as part of this scheme.

- Proposals for gate to BPP Road (6429\_LD\_PLN\_401 Rev A) are unclear, it appears from the plans that the gate is to be removed. This drawing needs to be updated to clarify the position.

The vehicle gates at Beckenham Place Park Road will be retained, but will be open during day to create a broad and welcoming entrance. Bollards situated just outside the park itself will prevent vehicular entrance. Please refer to the updated and clarified drawing (90)LD 102 Detail Area\_Secondary Entrances West Park.

- Works to Westgate Road entrance not clear. Existing plan and details of metal fence required.

Drawing amended and details of fence and gates provided. Please see drawing (90)LD102 Details Area\_Secondary entrances west park.

- Details of specification of gravel to stableyard and mansion foreground required. The conservation officer requested that some loose surfacing be used to mirror a typical stableyard of the period and enhance the visitor experience.

Although a resin bound surface will be used in these areas, the surface will not be brushed, such that considerable loose gravels are left on top of the resin bound gravels. This will achieve the audible 'crunch' of gravels for the visitor, and the feel of loose material underfoot, whilst also ensuring that the surface continues to appear uniform in character over time, by preventing bare patches occurring.

Please refer to updated drawing (90)LD 104 Detail Area\_Stable Yard.

- Clarification as to whether lighting is proposed to the car park. (Secure by design)

The project manager met with the designing out crime advisor for borough, Mark Callaghan who advised that lighting to car park is preferred. Lighting bollards are shown on plans from stableyard to car park. Although Secure by Design principles tend to prefer columns (downward lighting) to bollards (upward lighting) Mark recognised that in the heritage setting something less dominant would be more appropriate. The bollard lighting is intended to provide café staff who may be leaving after dark, light to the car park for exit. The two parking spaces next to the lit path will be reserved for staff. The disabled bays have therefore been moved two bays along. Please refer to updated drawings (90)LD 107 Detail Area\_Proposed Car Park and (90)LD 104 Detail Area\_Stable Yard.

- Homestead: The historic feeling that is evoked as a stable yard should not be lost. The introduction of planted trees is considered to have a negative impact and is not supported. This element of the scheme should be re-considered. Additionally, the link between the homestead courtyard and terrace/pleasure grounds should be made more generous. Revised plans required.

The proposed planting of trees in the stableyard has been removed from plans in response to this issue. The link between the homestead courtyard and terrace/pleasure grounds has been widened to improve physical access and visual permeability. Double gates will be used for this link (rather than the single width gates previously proposed) and these will be simple metal gates with relatively narrow rods, allowing views through even when the gates are closed.

Please refer to landscape drawing (90)LD 104 Detail Area\_Stable Yard, and to the architectural drawing by Thomas Ford and Partners PL-200 Proposed Stable Block E.

## Heritage

- Response to Historic England request of 22nd February for archaeological test pits awaited

The test pits were carried out within the site of the new car park as required. and the archaeological report was sent to planning on 17.5.2017. There were no finds within the test pits.

- Gardener's Cottage: very little detail has been provided for how this building is proposed to be refurbished, or how the side extension is to be demolished and re-built. At present it is considered that the side extension causes harm to the architectural character of the cottage, and its replacement is not encouraged. For a replacement to be acceptable, further details are required to demonstrate that it will be of high quality design and materials which enhance the character of the cottage.

New details provided and talked through with planners 9.5.17. Floor plans now included, including existing, windows and doors in existing openings, as stated, kitchen units to be shown on plans, with not on ventilation.

- Gate lodge & house: inadequate information has been provided to show how the proposals affect the identified historic fabric. Further information is required before this part of the proposal can be supported from a heritage point of view.

New details provided and talked through with planners on 9.5.17. Grilles on windows not to be included. Doors to be replaced not original.

- Heritage statement refers to lost views. Please provide details

The heritage statement refers to views which were one a feature of the landscape being lost over time, and largely due to golf tree planting. Many of these views will be reinstated as part of

the regeneration works, notably by the removal of some of the golf course planting, and through lifting tree canopies/ undergrowth in some areas. There is no mention of the proposed development resulting in lost views.

Please refer to drawing 6429\_LD-PLN\_302 - Site Wide Key Views which shows the historic views which will be restored through the scheme and the new views which the designers are keen to establish in the parkland to enhance the visitor experience of the open space.

Please also refer to the document BECK\_LUC\_Landscape Visualisations V1 which is a board used at the planning consultation event in January. This demonstrates some of the key changes in views in the landscape – which primarily restore views to the mansion from other parts of the park.

- Tennis kiosk identified as potential heritage asset. Further details and justification for removal required.

New details provided and talked through with planners 9.5.17. Please refer to the document prepared by the Heritage architect, Thomas Ford and Partners, Historical Statement kiosk.

### Environmental

- Ground Water Resources: whilst the proposed lake does not pose a significant risk to local groundwater quality, there is uncertainty around its design and sustainability. Thames Water request information on:
  - the proposed source of water supplying the lake; and
  - the sustainability of lake design accounting for current and future water resources.
- The impact of overland flow, and where any additional flows expected to go (EA)

The more extensive hydrology report, not initially submitted as part of the planning application was sent to planners and to Thames Water to address these queries.

Specialists continue to work on the technical design of the lake to ensure that it can be filled efficiently, function as an effective habitat, will be aesthetically pleasing and will remain sufficiently full throughout periods of drought. It is of utmost importance to the project team, the funders and the parks team that the lake is a success and further experts are currently being engaged to ensure the level of water is stable and the quality of water is high for decades to come.

- Confirm where the spoil from the proposed lake will go to, i.e. will this be re used on site or will it be taken off site?

The EA require the spoil for the creation of the flood embankments. Surveys to date show that it will be appropriate for use on this site to create the flood embankments themselves or associated landforms (such as build up for paths etc). The majority of the spoil will therefore be taken to the eastern side of the park for these works. Some spoil will also be used on the western side of the site to eradicate the landforms associated with golf and restore the historic parkland.

- Confirmation required that all biological survey data collected has been provided to the Greenspace Information for Greater London [GIGL]  
Yes, the ecologists employed on the scheme (Land use consultants) supply all information to GIGL as standard.
- Tree species mix- as per Tree Officer comments, the proposed species mix is not considered to be fully justified and is likely to benefit from introducing increased variety. Further details are required to explain the rationale for the proposed mix, giving consideration to additional species to promote interest and variety as well as increasing the robustness of planting in the park. (As a result of the recent resurgence of Ash die-back, no objections are raised to the removal of ash in the wet woodland and our tree officers have suggested that there could be a market for these trees when removed).

Trees already planted and included a good species mix. Alison has provided details to planning of what was planted.

Tree numbers for woodland whip planting 2017			
		total	% of total
Oak	Quercus robur	2000	16.2
Hornbeam	carpinus betulus	1830	14.8
field maple	acer campestre	1820	14.8
Hawthorn	crataegus monogyna	1440	11.7
honeysuckle	lonicera periclymenum	160	1.3
Hazel	corylus avellena	1875	15.2
Rowan	sorbus aucuparia	700	5.7
small leave lime	tilia cordata	940	7.6
Birch	betula pendula	1560	12.7
Total		12325	100

## Events

- Please confirm approximate number of attendees and nature of proposed 'medium scale' events. Please provide numbers of attendees at the recent Festival of Lights and Cyclo-cross events for comparison.

Medium scale events are 500-5000 people.

Festival of lights attracted ~1500 and the mansion house open day on 29<sup>th</sup> April attracted 2800. Cyclocross attracted ~150.

Once the premises license is granted for the park, it is expected that up to 10 medium scale events might be held in the park in a year. These would aim to provide considerable variety to attract diverse audiences to the park. All events will have to finish by 11pm in accordance with the premises licence application.

The previous events were held through the mansion's premises license or through a Temporary Event Notice (TEN) which can license an event for up to 500 people at one time.

All events expecting to attract over 3000 people will have to present event plans to the Events Safety Advisory Group (ESAG). Event management plans will need to address noise, traffic planning and parking provision, stewarding, security, set up and set down, including access and egress, litter clearance and waste disposal, police presence if required, first aid, lost children procedures, and include clear plans of the exact locations of different elements of the event.

The same information is required of smaller events, but is signed off by the parks team rather than ESAG.